

New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

TUESDAY, MAY 7, 1918

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York Corporation. Charles B. Smith, President; G. Vernon Rogers, Vice-President; Richard H. Lee, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address: Tribune Building, 234 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beckman 3080.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York. In the United States: OUTSIDE OF GREATER NEW YORK

Daily and Sunday..... \$10.00 5 mos. \$47.50 1 yr. \$85.00
Daily only..... 5.00 3 mos. 12.50 6 mos. 25.00
Sunday only..... 1.00 3 mos. 2.50 6 mos. 5.00

CANADIAN RATES
Daily and Sunday..... \$10.00 5 mos. \$45.00 1 yr. \$80.00
Daily only..... 5.00 3 mos. 12.50 6 mos. 25.00
Sunday only..... 1.00 3 mos. 2.50 6 mos. 5.00

FOREIGN RATES
Daily and Sunday..... \$24.00 5 mos. \$120.00 1 yr. \$240.00
Daily only..... 12.00 3 mos. 30.00 6 mos. 60.00
Sunday only..... 2.00 3 mos. 5.00 6 mos. 10.00

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter

GUARANTEE

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein. All rights of republication of all other matter herein are also reserved.

Since Three Years

This day three years ago the great Cunard liner Lusitania was torpedoed without warning by a German U-boat and sank in twenty minutes. The number lost was 1,150 passengers and crew, of whom 114 were Americans.

In a world already numbened by war to the thought of wholesale killing this news was passed in whispers. People could not bear to name the deed out loud. Why? For a reason which could not be analyzed on the instant. For a reason the German soul is not permitted to understand. Something much more precious than human life was dead.

"But what is the matter?" the Germans asked—Germans there and Germans here. "Did we not publish in the newspapers what we were going to do? They have only themselves to blame—those who sailed on the Lusitania."

Then for the first time we knew what a German does not know, and turned in horror from this glimpse of his archaic inwardness. We turned to see in our mind's eye the picture of people on the Lusitania's pier the day she sailed, laughing at the oblique three-inch "warning" which the German Embassy had inserted in the New York newspapers.

"Do they mean to torpedo us?" the passengers asked each other. "No," they said, answering their own question. "They want us to think they might. They are only trying to scare us off British ships. They wouldn't sink us. Pooh! They are civilized people."

The world could not have paid Germany a finer compliment. None of all that great ship's company was afraid to sail through the U-boat zone. At worst the ship might be captured. But that would be only an adventure. But that she would be sunk with all on board nobody could possibly imagine. We laughed with our departing friends, waved them *bon voyage*, threw the crumpled bits of newspaper into the river and came home. We never thought of it again until the news was whispered in our ear: "The Lusitania has been torpedoed!"

And now we know why we couldn't say it out loud. It was not that 1,150 lives had been taken suddenly in the most dramatic manner possible, not that 114 Americans had been slain, not that some of our most beloved citizens were among that number. It was not that Germany had done a dastardly thing in a ghastly way.

Unconsciously we realized that something infinitely more dreadful had happened. A great and powerful nation had broken the faith of civilization. Germany had betrayed the sacred trust which makes human society possible. She had turned barbarian in our midst.

The thought of a nation so powerfully equipped with the knowledge of civilization using it for the ends of tiger rationality filled us with awful premonitions.

From that moment we have been at war with Germany.

It was as futile then as it is idle now to say that the U-boat commander, long trained in iron discipline, had merely obeyed orders; that he had been told to sink the Lusitania, and sank her, without thought of his own moral responsibility, and that the crime lies not at his door, nor at the door of Germany, but upon the heads of the Hohenzollern war lords. The answer to this is that no really civilized human being could have either conceived or executed the deed. You cannot imagine an American or an English or a Japanese submarine crew having sunk the Lusitania, no matter what von Tirpitz issued the order.

Therein lies the abyssal distinction between what is German and what is not.

The German has not in his soul those intuitive restraints which cause the civilized man to stop on the threshold of a purely

rational decision between life by the tiger's law and death by the civilized code and say: "It is not the thing to do."

The Hun has no such stopping place.

When you talk to him of a law higher than that of self-preservation he accuses you of hypocrisy. He not only does not understand that law, but he does not know of its existence.

When you talk to him of that strange moral difference between killing in cold blood, rationally, as he does, and killing in hot blood, emotionally, as we kill, he thinks you are mad.

When you tell him we are at war with Germany because of the WAY she makes war, he is indignant. Call him a "barbar" and he weeps. Barbarians are moved easily to tears—but only for themselves.

We do not know why Germans are German. That is God's business. At any rate, it is not the first thing He has put in the world to be destroyed. That task has been reserved to us. We have no idea where it will lead us or when it will end. We know only that the war will last until we finish it. Then will the Lusitania be a monument to civilization more abiding than bronze, reaching to heaven. And the world will be a different place forever.

At Last—a Communiqué

The War Department has now recognized the need of an official American communiqué. This is another sign of our awakening war consciousness.

The official weekly review, which was discontinued last Sunday, belonged to the period of aloofness. It was apparently compiled from newspaper sources. It betrayed no inside knowledge of events or strategy in Europe. Its acumen never put the lay commentators in the newspapers or magazines to shame. It made no appeal to the public because it failed to do what an official bulletin is expected to do.

What the public wants—and what it ought to have—is direct official information from the front. If American troops are fighting, that fact cannot escape the German High Command. So far nearly all the details of the engagements in which our men have distinguished themselves on the Lorraine front have come to us from German bulletins. These details are, of course, colored to Germany's advantage. No colored military disadvantage could have resulted from a counter description of these actions prepared at our own general headquarters in France.

The home public's craving for news from the front is intense. It is also legitimate. Great Britain and France have found a way to gratify it without disregarding the limitations of military prudence. Our government can easily do the same.

Under Pharaoh's Rod

Now there arose up a new king over Egypt which knew not Joseph. . . . And the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigour.

And they made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field: All their service, wherein they made them serve, was with rigour.

History repeats itself. The clearest possible light is thrown on German purposes in the Ukraine by Vice-Chancellor von Payer's speech last Saturday before the Main Committee of the Reichstag.

That speech reads like a passage from Exodus.

Explaining the proclamation of German martial law in the Ukraine, Herr von Payer said:

"We had a lively interest in getting foodstuffs as speedily as possible. . . . The Rada had no means of insisting on the delivery of the grain by the population. The Germans, therefore, had to concern themselves with obtaining deliveries in accordance with the treaty."

"Our activity in this direction has been to a certain extent a source of discontent."

"The field sowing decree was issued because opposition to the proposed land expropriation created the danger that a great part of the soil would remain uncultivated."

"General von Eichhorn, in entire accord with the German minister, decreed a 'state of enhanced protection,' under which all offences against public peace and order may be judged by field tribunals."

Here the whole case of Germany in the Ukraine is put into a nutshell. The Ukrainians must serve Germany's needs by raising grain. If they do not raise it voluntarily they will be compelled to raise it. This service in the field, like that of the ancient Israelites in Egypt, is to be exacted with military rigor.

Von Eichhorn, von Hoffman, von Kühlmann and von Payer all speak the same language. It is the language of the Pharaohs who knew not Joseph. Throughout the whole tragic-comedy staged at Brest-Litovsk Germany had but one fixed purpose. It was not to give the Ukraine, Poland, Finland, Lithuania, Courland, Livonia and Estonia a "self-determination" and freedom, but to reduce them to slavery.

The children of Israel, who had gone into Egypt in quest of larger economic opportunity, found it turned for them into a land of bondage. The German Pharaoh has gone as a stranger into the old border provinces of the Russian Empire, offering them a phantom independence, and within three months has converted their inhabitants into peons,

whose forced labor is to replenish Germany's empty granaries.

What right, in fact, has any race or nation which accepts the protection or patronage of Germany except the right to become a German bondman—a hewer of wood and a drawer of water for the All Highest in Berlin? The Ukrainians have had their rude awakening. The enslavement of the Finns, the Poles, the Courlanders, the Lithuanians, the Estonians and the Livonians is only a matter of time. Then it will be the turn of the illusory Soviet republic of Russia to feel the German knout.

Yet Lenin and his government seem more concerned about the landing of a few Japanese and British marines at Vladivostok than they are about Germany's seizure of Sebastopol or the re-establishment of serfdom in the Ukraine.

That is Slav psychology. And victimized by it, Slavdom, in its infinite childishness, has already practically exchanged its new found and quickly dissipated freedom for an Egyptian servitude more cruel and onerous than it ever experienced or ever could have experienced under the Romanoff yoke.

"Out of Washington Atmosphere"

The Washington correspondent of "The Times" prints the story that the first thing that Mr. Schwab did when he was asked to become director of the shipbuilding work was to go directly to the President and say:

"I cannot undertake this position unless I have complete authority. The risk of failure otherwise is too great."

According to this story, Mr. Schwab was assured by the President that he should have this whole authority; and the first act after he took charge was to order the removal of the Fleet Corporation from Washington to Philadelphia. It is now reported that Mr. Ryan will move the aircraft organization from Washington "out into the automobile manufacturing section in the Middle West." Says the authority for this account:

"What Mr. Schwab wanted was to get his job off somewhere where he could run it; to get the work out of Washington atmosphere and interference."

What is evident to every thinking man is that we cannot make a success of this war unless we give adequate and unhampered authority to the men who are to do the job. Apparently the deeply disappointing delay—the so-called "failure" of the aircraft programme—was due as much as anything to a lack of centralized authority, and the same was true of all the disgraceful rows which characterized the shipbuilding work.

If Mr. Ryan and Mr. Schwab have this adequate authority, there may be expectation of success. If they have not got it, there is little hope that the deplorable disappointments of the year past have come to an end.

Squeaks

Yesterday in one of the subway cars a fan squeaked—distressingly. It was very annoying. Every one looked his thoughts.

Why should a mere squeak be able to stir so much mental perturbation? It probably goes very far into the depths of our psychic nature. People react to different kinds of squeaks and noises in a curiously different way. But almost all have some weak point. So we spend tens of millions largely to avoid squeaks. All told, counting in automobiles and engines of all sorts, and railway cars, and streetcars, and everything, the total number of wheels in the United States must run into the billions.

So to speak, civilization rests on wheels. And these on grease and oil. Counting their number and considering the bother of attending to them all, is it not a miracle how smoothly they run?

It is the same with the millions of little wheels, so to speak, in our heads. Rarely rarely do they run dry and begin to squeak. These squeaks are excellent warnings. They tell of the vital need there is, for rightly regarded, they can do much to insure the smooth and silent working of the machine.

Pitiless Publicity

The President has at last ordered a full inquiry by the Department of Justice into the reckless charges made against the Aircraft Production Board. These charges, emanating from Mr. Gutzon Borglum and the Aeronautical Society "of America," have been made the basis of the most scandalous attacks by certain United States Senators and "The New York Times," "The Times" even going so far as to declare that a "gigantic conspiracy" existed to betray the whole aircraft programme in the interest of Germany by men high in the United States government and the United States army.

If true this would have been the greatest scandal in any nation since the war began. But the investigation is to be made, not in response to the demands of Mr. Gutzon Borglum or the Aeronautical Society "of America," nor of "The New York Times," but at the urgent request of Mr. Howard E. Coffin, who organized the Aircraft Board and the whole aircraft programme—and up to last week was chairman of the board. Mr. Coffin in a telegram to the President said:

"Charges of dishonesty have been made against the Aircraft Board which demand the fullest inquiry be had in order that the reputation of innocent men may not be ruined."

To Mr. Coffin's request the President makes the following response:

"Your telegram received. You may be sure I shall cooperate in every way to prevent what you rightly foresee may happen. The Department of Justice will cooperate to the utmost in seeing that all charges are probed and the truth got at."

It is to be noted that this is very different from the tone and temper of the President's letter to the Attorney General demanding an investigation into the

charges of corruption and extravagance at Hog Island, "with a view, if true, to instituting criminal procedure." We know what came of this demand. There has been no "criminal procedure."

At the same time the President's correspondence with Mr. Borglum is made public, disclosing that nearly a month ago the President wrote to Mr. Borglum, saying:

"I hope you will be willing and that you feel it is your duty to put at the disposal of those whom I have appointed official investigators all the evidence that may be in your possession."

This is just what Mr. Borglum has failed to do, since Senator Brandegee read in the Senate the other day a letter from Mr. Borglum in which he declared that this he would not do unless it be to a body satisfactory, apparently, to Mr. Borglum.

It would be as unseemly to attempt to prejudice the inquiry by the Attorney General. But it is not out of place to say that Mr. Borglum's suspicions were presented to The Tribune, as they were to "The Times" and doubtless to other newspapers, and that it is on the basis of these suspicions that "The Times" was willing to go ahead last Thursday and make its charges of "a gigantic conspiracy" of "bold, powerful men" to wreck and betray the whole aircraft work, and to demand an investigation "by a Federal grand jury."

The public will be glad to know that this whole miserable business will now be thoroughly gone into and all this scandalous mess of insinuation, accusation and suspicion cleared up. We shall soon know whether there is one jot or tittle of truth in the "Times" "conspiracy" or the accusations against Mr. Coffin and his aids.

Mr. Untermyer

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Since my return here last night from Washington my attention is called to an editorial in your issue of April 29, headed, "Mr. Untermyer's Patriotism," to which I take emphatic exception, especially to the wholly baseless innuendo that there is something connected with my bond purchases that is lacking in the highest quality of patriotism. The entire tone of the article is gratuitously offensive, and there are baseless implications contained in it for which I feel I am entitled to a public apology.

Apart from the months that I have been spending travelling around the country at my own expense, at the request of the Administration, in aid of the several loans, I insist that the men who make the sacrifice, whether large or small, involved in pledging their credit to buy these bonds on instalments are assisting their government in a way that is to be applauded and not discouraged. The principle is the same whether it be the President, who set to the country the valuable example in saving by himself buying a \$50 bond on the \$5 instalment plan, or whether the purchase be in a large amount. In either event the loans will have to be financed by the banks and will involve a certain amount of inflation, as to the effect of which I, however, by no means share your fears. With the cost of everything at least double, a contraction of the currency is more to be feared than a reasonable inflation to correspond to the changed conditions. But that is beside the point of my present purpose in writing you.

I were the investment for which I was looking when I subscribed in Yonkers for \$600,000 of the loan, and which appears to be the point of your criticism, I could have gone into the market and bought the same bonds, on the same terms of credit, at about 96, by buying the second issue of bonds and exchanging them for the new, and would thus have acquired the new bonds for \$24,000 less than I paid for them in subsequent loan. The same is true of the previous loan, where I would have made a saving of \$30,000 by buying the same amount of bonds of the previous issue and converting them. I have now considerable over \$1,800,000 of the three issues, on account of all of which hundreds of thousands of dollars have been paid, and the balance of which will be paid as opportunity affords.

As I could have bought the bonds more cheaply in the market by buying the old bonds and changing to the new, at times, have reduced my obligations by the sales of bonds, had I not regarded that course as prejudicial to the success of the various loans. As it is, I have not sold a single bond of any of the issues.

In reluctantly disclosing my private affairs connected with the facts of my bond purchases to my friends and neighbors in the speech at Yonkers, I had in mind encouraging those who had not the money to buy on credit, and I am delighted to find that we have over 27,000 subscribers to this loan in a population of 92,000, which is at the rate of about one subscriber to every three and a half of the population. At the same time this bond issue in the United States! Think of that! That would mean to the country in its hour of need the success of the war, and its encouragement to the boys at the front!

And, pray, what would you have had me do? I had five alternatives:

1. To buy no more bonds.
2. To buy only so many bonds of any of these loans as I had at the moment the cash in hand to pay for.
3. To sell the bonds I owned of each prior issue and buy the new ones.
4. To convert the old bonds into the new ones, which would have saved me money, but would not have helped the loan.
5. To do as I did—hold all the old bonds and buy as many of the new ones as I felt I could handle without demoralizing the security markets by selling my securities at such a time. I feel that what I did was best for the loan at the expense of my personal interest.

Perhaps you will now be good enough to advise me, in view of your hypercritical criticism, what you would have done, if, as I assume without reservation, you had no concern save for the welfare of your country?

There are other loans coming, to which, by the way, I shall continue to subscribe, and in the same way, if necessary, to the extent of my last dollar of cash or credit, and so it is important that the question of the wisdom and quality of patriotism involved in that line of action which you have brought into question be settled right now and here for the guidance of others.

I shall expect you, with your usual sense of fairness, not to emaculate this lengthy screed, but either to print it in full or not at all, and if you conclude that you have been in the wrong, as I believe you will, that you frankly acknowledge your mistake and, contrary to newspaper custom, apologize. SAMUEL UNTERMYER. Yonkers, N. Y., May 4, 1918.



Uncle Sam: "I borrow one feather and in return will feed the chicken."
The Pan-German: "But I am always hungry, therefore I will eat the chicken."

COILED IN THE FLAG—HEARS-S-S-S-ST

The Lusitania's Own Fault

(From "New York American" Editorials)

May 8, 1915:

Both parties to the struggle which is now rocking Europe have held themselves superior to that code of laws and customs by which civilization has tried to remove from war something of its ruthlessness, to ameliorate somewhat the hardships and sufferings it imposes upon non-combatants.

To enforce wholesale starvation upon the peaceful population of an enemy is the task which has engaged the minds of statesmen and the overwhelming naval force of one nation, while to bring swift, sudden and unseen death upon peaceable ocean travellers under a hostile flag has been the ceaseless study of the rulers of another belligerent. . . . The fact is only emphasized to-day the fact that has long been apparent—that neither the Allies nor the Germans give to international law or custom any more adherence than may suit their immediate ends. They are both estopped from discussing this frightful catastrophe in the light of any international law or usage. As to its cruel and, in the end, futile and useless violation of every principle of ordinary humanity there can be no two opinions. . . .

May 10, 1915:

How small a company, amid the millions of souls of men and women and children who have died in torment since this war began, are the sad ghosts of the Lusitania's slain! How few are they amid the innumerable hosts of Europe's dead!

May 11, 1915:

The Lusitania incident in itself is, of course, no cause for a declaration of war. Cruel it was, and barbaric and shocking to every human mind. But the circumstances attendant upon it sharply distinguish it from those outrages which would justify an immediate declaration of war upon the part of the United States. . . .

Humanity is quite as much outraged by the barbarities perpetrated upon American citizens in Mexico as by the slaughter of American citizens upon a British ship. . . . If the disordered state of government in Mexico made it impossible to fix definitely the responsibility for the atrocities committed upon Americans there, so the uncertain interpretation of international law under modern conditions of warfare makes it difficult to fix precisely the responsibility for the deaths of our people on the Lusitania.

May 14, 1915:

THE PRESIDENT'S NOTE TO GERMAN.—The President's letter is undeniably vigorous, BUT IT IS POSSIBLY DANGEROUS AS WELL. The nation desired that its rightful demands should be laid before the German government, but it did not anticipate that the President would go so far beyond the plainly and soundly rightful scope of those demands as to invite a rebuff. . . . The President goes on practically to protest against the use of submarines by Germany in the war that country is waging on British commerce. This offers Germany the opportunity to retort that, so far as we are concerned, the method of her warfare against England is none of our business. . . . It is not our business to sympathize with Germany because her naval weapons are inadequate to meet the overwhelming power of the British navy, but it is certainly not our business to protest against the use by Germany of such weapons as she possesses.

May 16, 1915:

Can We Limit the Use of Submarines in War?

May 20, 1915:

WE have no right to question GERMAN'S USE OF SUBMARINES IN HER WARFARE UPON BRITISH COMMERCE. . . . It is no possible business of ours whether Germany sinks British ships with

torpedoes, with mines or with gunfire. . . . These are not matters between America and Germany, but SOLELY MATTERS BETWEEN GERMANY AND GREAT BRITAIN.

June 1, 1915:

Fair-minded men will not be intolerant of the German inquiry into the status of the Lusitania. That vessel WAS on the roster of the British navy as an auxiliary. She was built according to Admiralty plans, enjoyed a subsidy and was subject to a call to the fleet in time of war. The Germans claim she was armed—our officials deny it. The Germans claim she carried munitions of war—we claim the small arm cartridges she carried have not been so classed. . . . Yet if both these disputed points be settled in our favor, it still remains true that the Lusitania was to Germany an enemy vessel subject to capture and destruction.

June 6, 1915 (Signed Letter by Hearst):

Let Us Have Peace with Honor—If That Be Possible.

In our first note to Germany we demanded many things which we had every right to demand, but we sought to intrude other things which were beyond our rights either of exaction or suggestion.

Of course, such a demand could not be conceded by Germany, and it is fortunate for the maintenance of peace that Germany has replied to this extreme requirement in so moderate and friendly a spirit. . . . The destruction of the Lusitania . . . is an indictment not of Germany's warfare alone, but of war itself as war is now waged on land and sea. . . . Let us turn from the Lusitania, therefore, where these rights of interference are so ill defined and so questionable. . . . We are gaining every advantage by peace; we are securing every benefit by not being involved in this murderous and devastating war; our sons are safe; our fields are fruitful; our vaults are filled with the gold sent us by the warring nations; and our factories are busy supplying European nations with their needs.

We should not end all this and plunge into this European turmoil, where our sons will be slain and our wealth exhausted, unless there be patriotic necessity for such a course. . . . LET US STAND FIRMLY IN DEFENCE OF OUR JUST RIGHTS, EVEN THOUGH WE MUST MAINTAIN THEM BY FORCE OF ARMS, BUT LET US NOT PRECIPITATE THE COUNTRY INTO AN UNNECESSARY WAR BY GOING BEYOND OUR OWN RIGHTS AND DEMANDING THE PRIVILEGE OF DICTATING TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES IN MATTERS WHICH HAVE NOT YET RECEIVED THE REPUTATION AND SANCTION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST.

A. Lincoln in Charleston

(From The Charleston News and Courier) Liberty Loan posters bearing the likeness of Abraham Lincoln are to be seen in Charleston windows to-day.

We desire to call this fact to the attention of those newspapers of the North which are still doing their best to keep alive sectional animosity. Let them ponder a little, remembering all that Charleston was and recalling the things that happened here a little more than a half century ago.

Creel Camouflage

(From The Kansas City Star)

Of course, George Creel's declaration of pride in America's failure to prepare for war before war came was simply a declaration of incredible folly. If America was right in refusing to take ordinary precautions because it depended on Germany's word, then the Russian Bolsheviks were right in disbanding the army on Germany's promise not to conquer Russian territory. To-day the whole cause we are fighting for is in peril because we failed to make the preparations that the situation evidently called for. Every mother whose son is in France knows that he is assuming added risk because we have not been in a position to back him up with a large army fully equipped.

But leaving all this to one side, the same quality of mind that caused Mr. Creel to persist in defending a position which it is now apparent could lead only to disaster has virtually destroyed the usefulness of an important part of the activities of the committee over which he presides.

The Committee on Public Information has become the official "covering up" department in Washington. It has assumed to defend every department of the government. The result has been to discredit its reliability.

It is unnecessary to recall the rewriting of the dispatch about the attack on the first transports that arrived in France, or the recent sending out of false information about aircraft. The whole tendency is in this direction. "The Independent," of New York, for instance, is printing a weekly "message" to the American people from the government, delivered by George Creel. April 13 the "message" was headed, "Rotting at the Core: The Amazing Facts of Germany's Internal Breakdown." The article is based chiefly on an article published in an obscure German newspaper, the "Volkshalle" of Bochum. While in the last sentence the Creel "message" admits that the army is as strong as ever and must be defeated, the tendency of the article is to create a false impression of Germany's weakness.

Again, last week the "message" dealt with "Making Good on Guns." From this "message" the American people would learn, if they read it, that the ordnance bureau has been a model. Even the delays in the manufacture of the French 75s are excused on the ground that new machinery had to be made. "In short," says the article, "all the accusations against the ordnance bureau are accusations that are based on appearances, not on evidence."

The Senate Committee on Military Affairs, which investigated the delays in the production of the 75s, and which caused the complete reorganization of the bureau, will read this defence with amazement. On the Creel statement there should have been no reorganization of the ordnance bureau. General Crozier should still be at its head. Yet every well informed person knows that the mismanagement of ordnance production, which was revealed by the Senate committee, is one of the chief sources of weakness in our preparations to-day.

It is not to be expected that the Committee on Public Information should undertake to exploit failures in the department. Neither is it to be expected that the committee should go out of its way to mislead the public by covering up failures.

Unfortunately, under its present chairman the committee has created the impression of attempting to hide deficiencies under a veil of camouflage. The public has learned to distrust it so completely that its usefulness in giving out current information is gone.

The Countercheck Quarrelsome

(From The Los Angeles Times)

"The San Antonio Light" says editorially that Southern California "mainly depends upon the vacationist, the halt, the lame and the idle rich for her daily bread." What does San Antonio depend upon? The oil wells she has not? The grain harvests she does not reap? Her frost-bitten orchards or the great manufacturing establishments which do not adorn her streets? Or is she living upon the lies that President Law Olmsted told many years ago about the beautiful mud creek on whose banks she sits?